

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Nathan Winshall	Team: Squad #3	CCRB Case #: 201710141	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Force	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Thursday, 12/07/2017 3:59 AM	Location of Incident: Outside of § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] 32nd Precinct Stationhouse	Precinct: 32	18 Mo. SOL 6/7/2019	EO SOL 6/7/2019	
Date/Time CV Reported Thu, 12/07/2017 4:05 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Thu, 12/07/2017 4:05 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. Officers			
2. DTS Craig Jacob	05974	935049	SRG 1
3. POM James Morales	17639	952032	SRG 1
4. An officer			

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A. Officers	Force: Outside of § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] in Manhattan, officers used physical force against § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
B. Officers	Force: Outside of § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] in Manhattan, officers used physical force against § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
C. POM James Morales	Off. Language: Inside the 32nd Precinct stationhouse, Police Officer James Morales made remarks to § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] based upon race.	[REDACTED]
D. DTS Craig Jacob	Off. Language: Inside the 32nd Precinct stationhouse, Detective Craig Jacob made remarks to § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] based upon race.	[REDACTED]
E. An officer	Abuse: Inside the 32nd Precinct stationhouse, an officer refused to provide his/her name and shield number to § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
F. An officer	Discourtesy: Inside the 32nd Precinct stationhouse, an officer spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
G. Officers	Force: Inside the 32nd Precinct stationhouse, officers used physical force against § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Case Summary

§ 87(2)(b) filed this complaint on behalf of her adult son, § 87(2)(b) with the CCRB via telephone on December 7, 2017. § 87(2)(b) did not witness any of the incidents. No video footage was obtained in regards to this complaint.

On December 11, 2017, § 87(2)(b) was called at the telephone number she provided and stated that she had reserved a lawyer for the incident. § 87(2)(b) explained that the police had her son's cell phone and that he could be reached through her phone number, e-mail address, and mailing address. On December 13, 2017, § 87(2)(b) called the CCRB and stated that her lawyer, § 87(2)(b), did not want any person or entity to speak to her, her son, or anyone in her family, until they had spoken to him first. She provided a number for § 87(2)(b). Later that day, § 87(2)(b) was called and he stated that he was unfamiliar with the current case; however, he had represented § 87(2)(b) in the past. Still later that day, § 87(2)(b) called the CCRB and stated that she wanted to place the case on hold per the advice of § 87(2)(b). However, because § 87(2)(b) was only a non-witnessing complainant in the case, the undersigned investigator made additional attempts to contact § 87(2)(b).

Between December 14, 2017 and December 18, 2017, § 87(2)(b) was called three times and voicemail messages were left each time. On December 18, 2017, § 87(2)(b) called the CCRB and requested that the CCRB stop calling her family. The undersigned investigator explained that the CCRB needed to speak to § 87(2)(b) for the above reason but § 87(2)(b) reiterated that she did not want the CCRB to contact her son. Later that day, a Clear search was performed and seven new telephone numbers were recovered. One of these telephone numbers belonged to § 87(2)(b)'s father. On December 18, 2017, § 87(2)(b)'s father confirmed that § 87(2)(b) had advised that the family stop cooperating with the CCRB. § 87(2)(b)'s father was told that the CCRB needed to hear from his son that he wanted to stop the investigation, and he stated he understood and would tell his son to call the CCRB. On December 20, 2017, § 87(2)(b)'s father was called and he reiterated that § 87(2)(b) had advised their family to close the case. He then confirmed § 87(2)(b) number. Later that day, § 87(2)(b) was contacted and confirmed that he was representing § 87(2)(b) in a civil lawsuit and that he had advised § 87(2)(b) and his family to close the case.

In her initial phone statement, § 87(2)(b) named three other victims involved in the incident, none of which she could provide identifying information for. A BADS search identified two of the alleged victims, § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b). The memo book of PO James Morales, of the Strategic Response Group 01, identified the third victim as § 87(2)(b).

On January 5, 2018, § 87(2)(b) was contacted through a number found in a Clear search. § 87(2)(b) confirmed his phone numbers and his address and scheduled an interview for January 9, 2018. On January 9, 2018, § 87(2)(b) missed his scheduled interview without rescheduling or cancelling ahead of time. Between January 10, 2018, and January 29, 2018, the number § 87(2)(b) had been previously contacted at was called six times and voicemail messages were left each time. The other number § 87(2)(b) provided was called three times between January 10, 2018, and January 16, 2018. Each time, the undersigned spoke to § 87(2)(b)'s grandmother who stated that she would ask her grandson to call the CCRB. On the final attempt, she asked the undersigned to stop calling her. Between January 12, 2018, and January 20, 2018, two letters were sent to § 87(2)(b) at the address he confirmed. Both were returned to the CCRB. A Clear search recovered an additional address, to which three letters were sent. Those letters were returned as well. Whitepages, LexisNexis, DMV, and BADS searches did not recover any

additional addresses. On February 23, 2018, Department of Correction searches for NYS and NYC confirmed that § 87(2)(b) was not incarcerated.

Coles, BADS, LexisNexis, Clear, Whitepages, and DMV searches were conducted for § 87(2)(b) generating two phone numbers and one mailing address. On January 5, 2018, one of the numbers was called and an individual who was not § 87(2)(b) and did not know her answered. On January 26, 2018, the second number was called and an individual who was not § 87(2)(b) and did not know her answered. Between January 16, 2018, and January 29, 2018, three letters were mailed to the address recovered for § 87(2)(b). None were returned. On February 23, 2018, Department of Correction searches for NYS and NYC confirmed that § 87(2)(b) was not incarcerated.

On March 12, 2018, § 87(2)(b) called the undersigned investigator, confirmed his contact information, provided a phone statement, and scheduled a CCRB interview for March 15, 2018. On March 15, 2018, § 87(2)(b) missed his scheduled CCRB interview without calling beforehand to cancel or re-schedule. On March 30, 2018, § 87(2)(b) was contacted and stated that he did not wish to participate in the complaint any further.

§ 87(2)(g)

Squad No.: 3

Investigator:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date
Squad Leader:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date
Reviewer:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date